C.8.1.06

(1) (B)

SINGLE BENCH

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION No. 1865 OF 2006

PETITIONERS : Madhusudan Lal Purohit, S/o. Late Shri Raman Lal Purohit aged About 66 years, R/o. HIG- 15, Tatibandh, Raipur (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS : 1. State of Chhattisgarh
Through : Dharmada

2. Registrar,
Public Trust,
Raipur (C.G.)

3. Collector, Raipur (C.G.)

4. Girdhar Bhavan Dharamsala Trust, Raipur, A Public Trust, registered Under C.G. Public Trust Act, through Manoharlal Purohit, aged about 62 years, son of Late Shri Lalit Lal Purohit, R/o. Burhapara, Raipur (C.G.)

5. Manoharlal Purohit, aged about 62 years, son of Late Shri Lalit Lal Purohit, R/o. Burhapara, Raipur (C.G.)

6. Sharad Lal Purohit, aged about 46 years, son of Late Shri Lalit Lal Purohit R/o. Burhapara, Raipur (C.G.)

RECEIVED-COPY
5.4.06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

P.R. No. 1915/06
Presented by Shri A.K. Jadav
dated 5/4/06

(2) (4)

7. M/s. Harpreetam Enterprise, Raipur (C.G.), a partnership firm, through its partner Harjeet Singh Bhatia, son of Gurdayal Singh, aged 50 years near Netaji Hotel, Raipur (C.G.)

8. Smt. Anita Singhwani, wife of Shri Ajay Singhwani, aged 50 years R/o. Jawahar Nagar, Raipur (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, CERTIORARY AND/OR ANY OTHER SUITABLE WRIT OF LIKE NATURE

124

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH : BILASPUR

S.B.: Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.

Writ Petition No. 1865 of 2006

Petitioner : Madhusudan Lal Purohit

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

Present : Dr. N.K. Shukla, Senior Advocate with Shri Shailendra Shukla, Advocate for the petitioner.
Smt. Anju Ahuja, Dy. Govt. Advocate for the Respondents No. 1 to 3/State.
Shri P.K. Bhaduri, Advocate for the respondents No. 7 and 8.

ORDER
(Passed on 23rd day of February, 2007)

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner seeks permission of this Court to withdraw this petition with liberty to take recourse to legal remedies that may be available under the provisions of law. He further submits that the status quo of the building in dispute should be maintained for a period of four weeks till the petitioner moves the appropriate forum for interim relief, to which learned counsel appearing for the respondents has no objection.

2. It is ordered accordingly.

3. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed as withdrawn with the aforestated observation.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge